Joint Warfighting Concept Development

Round 1 Pros & Cons

JFCOM/J9 Perspective

John DeFoor
USJFCOM/J9
john.defoor@je.jfcom.mil

Pros

- **Robust Service, JS, STRATCOM, NORTHCOM, and JFCOM involvement at the Senior Leader level (2 star and above). Allowed faster exchange of ideas and iterations than the 136 process and supported a top down approach.**
- **Access to leading minds, senior concept developers, and other resources has been excellent. Provided a wealth of ideas and options. (Examples include Mr. Newt Gingrich, Rupert Smith, Field Commanders in Iraq, Dr. Alberts, Dr. Hayes…)**
- **Discovery experimentation (PI03 and Co-Sponsored events) coupled with Lessons Learned from current ops proved very effective in establishing concept foundations**

Cons

- **Still more "concept development through staffing" rather than "concept development through experimentation", even for the JFCOM concepts. If this trend continues it will have an even greater negative impact for follow-on versions.**
  - **Establish experimentation expectations for the different versions**
- **While the JOpsC delivers a context for the process of concept development, it fails to provide an operating context.**
  - **Include a global campaign construct in the update**

Cons

- **Concept development pace greatly outstrips experimentation pace. Experimentation means available are too scarce, too expensive, and too ponderous to adequately vet all developing concepts.**
  - **Continue Co-Sponsored events**
  - **Develop easily iterated constructive and virtual experimentation capability at JFCOM**
  - **Develop a way to distribute experiment effort that meets needs of Joint community and of individual experimenting organization**
- **Apparent “shotgun” approach to second round of concepts.**
  - **Conduct a fresh-look methodical mission and functional analysis of the mission space.**